



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,363	07/18/2006	Gerard Mouaici	0563-1077	2993
466	7590	09/06/2007	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON			PATIDAR, JAY M	
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2ND FLOOR			2862	
ARLINGTON, VA 22202			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/586,363	MOUAICI, GERARD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Jay M. Patidar	2862	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 7-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-10, 12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11, 14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/18/06.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract does not set forth the nature and gist of the invention.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The subject matter as set forth in claim 10.
4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore,

- the subject matter as set forth in claim 10;
- MRs being offset 45 degree as set forth in claim 11

must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).

No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "24" has been used to designate both microcontroller and MR (figs. 1,2). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only

one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. Claims 1 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, the phrase "taking the form of a ring" is vague; the phrase "a ring or a portion of a ring" is not positively recited; it is unclear as to what the parallel directions are (line 8); what the series of lines (line 12); and what the same direction is;

In claim 10, the phrase "takes the form..." is vague; how a portion of a ring extends 120 degrees.

Appropriate correction is required.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-10,12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sidor (4,137,512) in view of Hipp et al. (5,825,178).

Sidor discloses a contactless magnetic field sensing device with a magnet 26 and magnetoresistive sensors 46,48 wherein the magnet comprises north and south poles. The use of semi-circular magnet or a circular magnet is known in its related art for determining the rotational position of the object as taught by Hipp. Sidor does not disclose that the magnet is made from a strip. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Sidor to have included multiple poles magnet as taught by Hipp to determine the rotational position of the object. The use of magnet strip or flexible magnet strip is known in the related art. Additionally, as to the limitation "magnet is cut from...(method of making a magnet)" in claim 1, it is the Examiner's opinion that such a method step in a product claim, " which product is not patentably distinguished from the prior art, cannot impart patentability to the old product." *In re Dilnot*, 133 USPQ 289,292 (CCPA 1962), citing *In re Moeller*, 28 CCPA 932, 117 F.2d 565, 48 USPQ 542 ; *In re Lifton*, 38 CCPA 1119, 189 F.2d 261, 89 USPQ 641 ; *In re Shortell*, 36 CCPA 1013, 173 F.2d 993, 81 USPQ 359 . "Even though product - by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The

patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product - by - process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process [emphasis added]." *In re Thorpe* , 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). See MPEP 2113.

8. Claims 11,14-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art fails to show two MRs being offset 45 degree in combination with other elements of claim 1.
10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay M. Patidar whose telephone number is 571-272-2265. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur 7:00-5:30.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jay M. Patidar/  
Jay M. Patidar  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2862  
Email: [Jay.Patidar@USPTO.gov](mailto:Jay.Patidar@USPTO.gov)

August 31, 2007